



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/410,483	09/30/1999	PARTHASARATHY SARANGAM	042390.P7091	6937

7590 11/21/2003

ALOYSIUS TC AUYEUNG
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

WON, YOUNG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

/6

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/410,483

Applicant(s)

SARANGAM ET AL.

Examiner

Young N Won

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 16-19 and 25-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 16-19 and 25-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 16, and 25 has been amended and claims 1-9, 16-19, and 25-35 have been re-examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Independent:

2. Claims 1-7, 9, 16, 17, 19, 25-27, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Spencer (US 6253243B1).

As per claims 1, 16, and 25, Spencer teaches a method (see col.19, line 37) and an apparatus (see col.21, line 24) comprising: detecting alert events on a client using a platform independent (see col.1, line 60 to col.2, line 4) agent integrated with said client (see col.1, lines 32-59); reporting detected alert events by said platform independent agent to a remote alert proxy in a platform independent manner complemented by a platform type (see col.2, lines 18-65); receiving the detected alert events of a client device from an integrated platform independent agent (see Fig.1) of the client device by the server; obtaining an identifier from the reported detected alert event (see col.2, lines 18-65 and col.8, lines 1-3); mapping the identifier to a representation of a specific platform type (see Fig.5, # 510; col.7, lines 27-29; and col.8, lines 1-21); and translating said reported alert events to platform specific alert events via said alert proxy by referring to a specific section of an event description file using the mapped representation (see col.2, lines 5-17 and col.9, lines 24-42).

As per claims 27 and 32, Spencer teaches of a system (see title) and an article of manufacture comprising a machine readable medium having a plurality of machine readable instructions stored thereon (see col.18, lines 61-67 and col.20, line 44), wherein when the instructions are executed by a processor, the instructions subscribe the processor to: receive a data packet containing a detected alert events of a device from an integrated platform independent agent device in a platform independent manner complemented with a platform type (see col.2, lines 18-65); parse the received detected alert event, according to an encapsulation protocol, to predetermined variables (see Fig.6; col.9, lines 32-35; col.11, lines 21-25; and col.13, lines 5-9); assign values

obtained by parsing the data packet to predetermined variables (see col.1, lines 55-59 and col.13, lines 22-53); and translate said received alert events to platform specific (see col.16, lines 61-62) alert events, wherein the translating includes comparing the assigned values to an event description file to determine platform specific alert information (see col.2, lines 5-17 and col.9, lines 24-42).

As per claim 29, Spencer teaches of a system (see title) comprising: a computing device having a management application (see Fig.1, #106) and an alert proxy (see col.7, lines 62-65), the alert proxy to translate command data received from the management application into device-specific control data (see col.7, lines 27-31), wherein the translating includes determining an identifier and using the identifier to reference an event description file (see col.2, line 52 to col.3, line 20); and an other computing device coupled to the computing device having a platform-independent (see col.1, line 60 to col.2, line 4) alert detection element to report detected alert events to the computing device (see Fig.1 and col.1, lines 32-59).

Dependent:

As per claim 2, Spencer further teaches wherein detecting said alert events on said client further comprises detecting alert events while said client is in a reduced function state (see col.6, lines 36-38).

As per claim 3, Spencer further teaches wherein said reduced function state includes an operating system hung state (see col.2, lines 22-27).

As per claim 4, Spencer further teaches wherein reporting said detected alert events further comprises: composing a network data packet (see col.16, lines 20-24), said network data packet including an event code (see col.7, lines 27-31); and transmitting said network data packet including said event code to said remote alert proxy (see col.7, lines 42-48).

As per claim 5, Spencer further teaches wherein composing said network data packet comprises encapsulating said network data packet according to at least one of a plurality of encapsulation protocols including a remote management and control protocol (RMCP) and a simple network management protocol (SNMP) (see col.2, lines 13-17).

As per claim 6, Spencer further teaches wherein said event code includes a BIOS POST code (see col.7, lines 5-15: <generic-trap> Table).

As per claims 7, 17, and 26, Spencer further teaches wherein said translating (see col.7, line 66 to col.8, line 1 and col.9, lines 24-25) said reported or received alert events to platform specific events (see col.7, lines 27-31) by said alert proxy further comprises referencing a description data file using said platform type (see col.9, lines 4-7).

As per claims 9 and 19, Spencer further teaches wherein referencing said description data file comprises referencing one of a management information format (MIF) file (see col.4, lines 48-52) and a management information block (MIB) file (see col.8, lines 5-17 & 35-46).

As per claim 30, Spencer further teaches wherein the alert detection element further to receive the translated command data and using the translated command data to set or clear registers within the other computing device (see col.2, lines 28-33).

As per claim 33, Spencer further teaches wherein comparing the assigned values further includes determining whether the alert message describes a simple event, compound event, or a software event (see col.2, lines 22-27).

As per claim 35, Spencer further teaches wherein assigning values obtained by parsing the data packet further comprises obtaining an identifier to identify a platform type corresponding to the alert message (see col.7, lines 27-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 8, 18, 28, 31, and 34, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer (US 6253243B1) as applied to claims 1, 16, 27, 29, and 32 above, and further in view of Regnier et al. (US 5689708A). Spencer does not teach wherein referencing or reporting said description data file comprises referencing or reporting a plain text ".ini" file. Regnier teaches wherein referencing said description

data file comprises referencing a plain text "ini" file (see col.2 lines 45-49). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to employ the teachings of Regnier within the system of Spencer, by making the data files be of a plain text "ini" file, because "ini" files are commonly used in servers in applying restrictions upon clients, thus making the system of Spencer more versatile and also to prevent further harm to the client system.

Response to Remarks

4. In regards to the remarks of claims 1, 16, 25, 27, 29, and 32, Spencer clearly teaches of obtaining an identifier from the reported detected alert events (see col.2, lines 18-65 and col.8, lines 1-3), mapping the identifier to platform specific alert events (see Fig.5, # 510; col.7, lines 27-29; and col.8, lines 1-21) by referring to a specific section of an event description file using the mapped representation (see col.2, lines 5-17 and col.9, lines 24-42). Therefore, claims 1, 16, 25, 27, 29, and 31 are anticipated by Spencer.

Claims 2-9, 17-19, 26, 28, 30-31, and 33-35 depend upon the above-mentioned claims and thus remain rejected.

Likewise, claims 8, 18, 28, 31, and 34 depend upon the above-mentioned claims wherein the limitations of "obtaining an identifier from the reported detected alert events, mapping the identifier to a representation of a specific platform type, and translating

Art Unit: 2155

said reported alert event to platform specific alert events by referring to a specific section of an event description file using the mapped representation" are taught by Spencer, and thus remain rejected.


Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Young N Won whose telephone number is 703-605-4241. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 8AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Young N Won



November 18, 2003



**FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**